/778 cont./

602 571 572 families within the same ethnic unit. Groups living far apart sometimes do not even know one another; their mutual estrangement is favorable soil for the growth of suspicion, mistrust, and animosity. Insecure and harsh economic conditions react on the social level in a centrifugal sense, if we may so express it (209).

209. Stirling, who has let some inaccuracies creep in, says: "Family life in Fuegia is exclusive. Get outside the family, and relationships are doubtful, if not hostile. The bond of a common language is no security for friendly offices. To be of the same tribe is no guarantee of safety in travelling. Fear and distrust are stronger than tribal affinities" /cited in English/ (MM:IV,11; 1870).

619 Nevertheless, there is a true tribal society on a modest scale. It is based on a common origin and language; it is expressed in the fact that everyone acts in exactly the same way and that all are subject to a definite, unwritten, universally binding law. Every individual feels that he is a member of the whole, he knows that he is united with one who can make himself intelligible to him in the same language, and he traces his origin to the same source as all others who are just as lawfully rooted in his native soil as he is. This consciousness becomes so strong that, as individuals and as a community, they are convinced that they form a special group; they believe themselves to be "the people," the ethnic unit having exclusive right of existence in their homeland. The boundaries of their homeland are regarded as something given in ancient times (210), whose legal validity is thus inviolably se-

210. Bridges (k):233 first learned of the homeland boundaries from the Yamana themselves.

cure for all time, no matter what the explanation for the original bounds of native territory and its first occupation by their fore-fathers.

/778 cont./

619 554 Basically one tribal member is equal to every other socially and enjoys complete independence. All of them have about the same number of objects, little though this is, and there are no differences in property and economic pursuits which elsewhere sometimes cause very disparate social levels (211). In general,

> 211. This means, as Hyades (y):338 expresses himself: "There is no king, chieftain, aristocracy, caste, social hierarchy, or slaves; it is a regime of equality in the purest sense" /translated from French/.

therefore, every adult has the same rights within his tribe, and along with this they all have some duties. No one is specifically raised above the legal equality of the multitude by special privileges; they recognize neither one nor several headmen. One person or another may acquire a certain morally superior position within the narrow circle of relatives and acquaintances /779/ through richer experience after a long life and moral rectitude. His superiority, however, is solely a matter of personality and is neither precisely defined nor founded on objective legal norms.

[197] A division of the whole tribe into so-called dialect groups has occurred under the pressure of local conditions. It is purely external. The slight differences resulting from it are in line with the unavoidable pursuit of a livelihood by each independent group. The social order in which degrees of rank are unknown is just as simple as the economic structure (212).

> 212. The basic ideas of this section have already been published by Koppers (c):155.

a. Kinship

597 602 Yamana social organization rests on individual families (213).

> 213. Spegazzini (a):165 gives this fact in another form: "The family constitutes all their society" /translated from Spanish/.

/191 cont./

60 to become related to any person as son-in-law or father-in-law through marriage." mötčkinaka, "to receive or bring from the west any gift, or to come and do any kind of service for a father-in-law for his daughter." kise, a term of respect used by persons related through marriage to direct questions or requests to one another, for example, son-in-law and daughter-in-law to each other or fathers and mothers to their sons-in-law and daughters-in-law and vice versa. It has no other special meaning. kise, kiseše, verbal prefix used between persons related through marriage to about the same extent as kise above and in the same situation (227). This concludes the present summary.

227. In SD Yamana words lack an accent mark for stress. Hence it was not added to the above-mentioned words. See Gusinde (bb):181.

b. Tribal Society

69 Fuegian tribal society does not represent a closely knit, internally linked social structure. Actually it is only a loose juxtaposition of individual families. Each of the latter, however, is definite and well articulated.

All fellow tribesmen who can make themselves intelligible to one another by means of a common language are, for this reason, aware of being united to a certain extent and conscious of their homogeneity. All together they constitute a single people and are differentiated from other peoples in many external respects, as well as through spiritual assets and their own propensities. Not only do the individuals describe themselves in terms of these positive realities, but far beyond that, they value and praise what they regard as their uniqueness. Indeed, with justifiable national pride, they regard themselves as superior to neighboring peoples and to other human societies. They make no effort to determine or even to question whether they are not perhaps surpassed in many respects by other peoples. Their strongly developed self-awareness and self-satisfaction reject from the start all such comparisons.

/797 cont./

619 An attribute of this mental attitude and trend of thought of the Yamana is their pronounced consciousness of homeland. They know the exact boundaries that separate their territory from their neighbors, and they regard this territory as exclusively theirs; every stranger in it is an intruder. They are intimately attached to their homeland and particularly deeply rooted in their narrower local region. /798/ They praise its beauty and advantages, without, however, indulging in extravagant enthusiasm; they are thinking only of the material goods that it furnishes them. They feel a strong impulse to come back to it after they have been far away to trade or hunt or to attend festivals. In their opinion, complete happiness flourishes only on one's native soil. A Yamana who must live outside his local homeland, that is to say, outside his so-called local group, feels like someone living in a bleak, alien land. He misses the many things it offered him, or at any rate he imagines he does, and he yearns to go back.

186 In the case of Nelly Lawrence her love for her home often came out very strongly. An important contributory factor was her very different form of life by the side of her European husband on the farm in Punta Remolino. When she began telling about her beloved West from where she came, this quiet, taciturn woman who was almost too timid to speak became unbelievably lively and talkative. Then she would praise the beauty of the landscape with its many glaciers and meandering waterways, the steep peaks with their eternal snow, and the sheltered safety of the many calm bays. She would extol the fresh green of the dense beech forests of that rainy zone and the quiet ways of its animal kingdom. Finally, she would put her own countrymen above all praise. She presented everything as a special advantage, chiefly in contrast to the feared neighbors of the western Yamana, the Halakwulup. She never let an opportunity go by to emphasize strongly in front of others that the lovely pasána song is native to her region, that a story from there spread to the east, that at the large secret gatherings this or that special form is customary there, and so forth. Truly, the Fuegian, too, loves his home with a whole and warm heart. This one example is convincing proof.

2: Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SH6 Yahgan SH6

586 second wife. Desertion was more frequent on the man's part than on the woman's.

888 The aged were, according to all dependable evidence, usually respected, well treated, and well cared for. Neither abandonment or killing of the aged was ordinarily practiced but may have occurred in exceptional cases.

621 Political life.—Over and above the biological family there was no closely organized larger group or constituted authority. There were no sibs, secret or other societies, or social classes, and no chiefs or ruling group or caste of any kind. Each biological family was for most practical purposes a sovereign political unit. The sense of *individual independence* was deep. No man took or brooked orders
555 or dictation from any other. However, aggressive individuals of personal force and strength, especially if they had powerful kin backing, at times dominated. Older men of recognized intelligence and integrity exercised considerable moral influence.

612 The next group to the biological family was the kinship group, mostly a paternal one. The members gave mutual aid where called for, particularly in feuds and in blood-revenge activities. The kinship group, owing to common patrilocal residence, was partly, but not fully localized.

619 The five regional divisions of the *Yahgan*, each with its distinctive dialect, had very slight political significance. Members of one division were usually chary of trespassing, at least for long, upon the territory of any other division, unless there were a recognized good cause, such as grave shortage of food, partaking of a stranded whale, trading, gathering canoe bark or fire-making materials.

621 Each of the five dialectic regions was broken up into local groups, each of which appears to have been composed, mostly at least, of members related by blood or marriage (Koppers, 1926 b, p. 5). Each such local group had its own territory—that of Ushuaia, for instance, occupied 20 miles (32 km.) of coast line on Beagle Channel—and its own name derived from its locality. Like the dialectic groups,
[622] these local groups had no chiefs. The local group's chief function was that of holding the čiéxaus initiation rite. The leader chosen
[881] therefor had authority only so long as the rite lasted. As the čiéxaus rite was an educational device contributing greatly to social conformity and solidarity, the local group's political function was chiefly an indirect pedagogical one. Loyalty to fellow members of a local group existed, but was not as strong as that to one's own kinship group.

628 There was no organized process of judicial procedure. In case
[682] of murder, the victim's kin took blood revenge on the murderer or his kin, or settled with him or them by composition. At times such kinship feuds led to a sort of pitched battle, in which slings,

2: Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SH6 Yahgan SH6

clubs, fists, and so forth were used freely, with no holds barred, but grave wounds or deaths were uncommon. Organized warfare did not exist, and the *Yahgan* had no defensive weapons. The weapons used in their feuds were primarily made for, and adapted to, hunting.

Social relations within and between the dialectic and local groups appear to have been normally irenic, but violence and bloodshed were not infrequent. The friends of fighting parties usually intervened, both by persuasion and by force, to restore peace. A murder was strongly condemned, and the murderer often became an outcast. Bridges found 22 cases of homicide between 1871 and 1884—an annual rate per population something like 10 times as high as that of the United States. Mercy killings occurred for the purpose of putting an end to the sufferings of the hopelessly ill. Human sacrifice was unknown; so too was premeditated suicide.

The evidence that the *Yahgan* practiced no form of cannibalism—gastronomic, famine, ritual, or other—is convincing beyond all reasonable doubt. They would not even eat animals suspected of devouring human flesh.

ECONOMIC LIFE

Ownership.—The *Yahgan* resented and avenged exploitative trespass upon their tribal territory or attempted occupation of any part thereof by non-*Yahgan*, Indian or White. So, too, did members of any one of the five dialectic groups (Gusinde, 1937, pp. 964–965) or, according to Koppers (1928 b, p. 176), of any one of the numerous local groups, by nonmembers. Since these local groups seemingly were chiefly kinship groups (cf. supra, Political Life), the *Yahgan* land-tenure system resembled the family-hunting-ground system. There was no exclusive tenure by kinship circles as such, by biological families, or by individuals.

Members of one dialectic or local group could, however, exploit the territory of other groups to secure food in grave shortage, to feast on a stranded whale, and to gather firestones and suitable canoe bark, which were found only in certain parts of the *Yahgan* territory. Ownership of personal property, such as weapons, clothing, adornments, and baskets, was vested in the individual. Women and children, as well as men, had well-recognized rights to such things. The ownership of certain other things—food, hut, canoe—appears to have been vested in the biological family.

Food was looked upon as the property and gift of the Supreme Being; wasting it was disrespectful to Him.

Title to personal property was acquired through occupation, labor, donation, and barter. Barter took two forms: plain, or exchange of goods for goods; and by exchange of presents. There was no cur-